Chapter 1

The Seeds of Karbala — Allegiances, Betrayals, and Political Transition

Chapter 1 The Seeds of Karbala — Allegiances, Betrayals, and Political Transition

Introduction:

Before proceeding toward the events of Karbala, it is essential to first understand its origins and identify the turning points in the original story. This chapter explores the events following the martyrdom of Sayyiduna Ali (RA), when Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) became Caliph. It discusses how people pledged their support to him, and how he ultimately chose peace over war by handing leadership to Amir Muawiyah (RA).

The chapter also addresses a serious accusation—that Muawiyah (RA) poisoned Hasan (RA) to make way for his son Yazid. By looking at reliable sources, we will see that this claim is weak and that Hasan (RA) himself never blamed anyone. Through this chapter, we will understand how early divisions, betrayals, and political decisions led to the events of Karbala. It helps explain why the peace treaty happened, the actions of the people of Iraq, and how history was shaped long before the tragedy occurred.

The Historical Context and Accusations:

While the people of Hijaz had pledged allegiance to Amir Yazid, no uprisings were recorded from any side until the death of Sayyiduna Amir Muawiyah (RA) in 60 Hijri. However, certain historical accounts claim that Sayyiduna Amir Muawiyah (RA) conspired to poison Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) to ensure the succession of his son Yazid, thereby transforming the Caliphate into a hereditary monarchy.

In reality, this accusation—pushed by certain historians—is based on a distorted interpretation of the peace agreement. These historians argue that Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) had included a clause in the treaty stating that the Caliphate would return to him after Sayyiduna Muawiyah (RA). From this, they constructed the narrative that Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) was the only obstacle to Muawiyah's plans for a monarchy, and thus, he had him poisoned.

This accusation will be addressed in more detail later. However, it is necessary first to review the circumstances surrounding the pledge of allegiance to Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) and the state of those who pledged to him.

The Allegiance to Sayyiduna Hasan (RA):

After the martyrdom of Sayyiduna Ali (RA), forty thousand people pledged allegiance to Sayyiduna Hasan (RA). The people of Iraq pledged to him on two grounds: first, for leadership and the Caliphate; and second, that they would support whatever he decided and follow him wherever he went.[1]

Notably, the foundation of this allegiance was the approval of Sayyiduna Ali (RA), who had appointed Hasan (RA) as his heir. Contrary to common belief, Sayyiduna Hasan’s (RA) Caliphate was not established through the traditional process, but through heirship (*Wilayah*). This is explicitly stated in various Shi’a texts such as *Maqātil al-Ṭālibīn*, *A‘lām al-Warā*, *Kashf al-Ghummah*, and *Ithbāt al-Hudā*. According to these sources, Sayyiduna Abdullah ibn Abbas (RA) stood before the people and proclaimed, “This is Sayyiduna Hasan (RA), the son of the daughter of the Prophet (PBUH). Pledge allegiance to him, for he is your trustee (*wasiyy*), your Imam.”

Shi’a scholars elaborated further, stating that Sayyiduna Ali (RA) had clearly appointed Hasan (RA) as his successor. Some reports even

mention that Sayyiduna Jundub asked Ali (RA) on his deathbed whether they should pledge allegiance to Hasan (RA), and he affirmed it. This is documented in *Sharh Nahj al-Balaghah*, *al-ʻIqd al-Farīd*, and *Manāqib Khwarizmi*.[2]

Ibn Kathir notes: “Sayyiduna Ali had appointed Hasan as his heir. After him came Amir Muawiyah (RA), followed by his son Yazid…” He further states that the Ahl al-Sunnah believe all twelve caliphs—including Yazid—were just.[3] Hence, appointing a son as heir was not considered illegitimate in either Shi’a or Sunni beliefs.

The Betrayal of the Kufans and the Peace Treaty:

After pledging allegiance, Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) addressed the people and advised them to return home, saying that this Caliphate was of no more worth to him than a mustard seed—not even worth the blood drawn from cupping.[4] This statement revealed Hasan’s (RA) disdain for bloodshed and power-seeking.

He then moved to Madain with his followers and appointed Qais ibn Sa‘d ibn ‘Ubādah as commander of a 12,000-strong army, known as *Shurtat al-Khamis*.[5] Meanwhile, Amir Muawiyah (RA) sent Busr ibn Artat. A brief skirmish occurred, but no blood was shed, and both armies dispersed.

While in Madain, news falsely spread that Qais ibn Sa‘d had been killed.[6] In response, the Shi’a turned against Sayyiduna Hasan (RA), tore down his tent, pulled away his mat, and one even stabbed him with a dagger. He remained ill for a long time and was close to death.[7] Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) then realized that the Kufans, not Amir Muawiyah (RA), posed the greatest threat to his life.

In contrast, Muawiyah’s (RA) Syrian army was disciplined and motivated by the desire to avenge the unjust killing of Sayyiduna Uthman (RA)—a murder committed by the same Iraqis and Kufans. Sayyiduna Abdullah ibn Abbas (RA) quoted Surah Al-Isra (17:33): “And do not kill the soul which Allah has forbidden, except by right…”. Using this, he supported Muawiyah’s (RA) leadership.[8]

Muawiyah (RA), upon seeing the weakened state of Hasan’s (RA) army, feared that they would be annihilated. He wondered: who would then protect their women and children?[9]

When Hasan (RA) was injured by his own followers, he sought reconciliation.[10] Muawiyah (RA) sent Abdullah ibn Aamir and Abdur Rahman ibn Samurah for negotiations. Hasan (RA) consulted with Abdullah ibn Ja‘far, who supported peace. Hasan (RA) then addressed the Iraqis: “You killed my father, stabbed me, and looted my wealth. Fear Allah regarding us! We are your rulers and your guests.”[11]

The two parties met at Nukhayla, where Hasan (RA) pledged allegiance to Muawiyah (RA). He then gave a sermon: “The best wisdom is piety; the worst foolishness is sinfulness. If I was right, I stepped down for the Ummah’s unity and to avoid bloodshed. If Muawiyah (RA) was right, then I conceded to his more rightful claim.”[12]

This event took place in Rabi’ al-Awwal, 41 Hijri, and is known as *‘Ām al-Jamā‘ah* (Year of Unity). That same year, Muawiyah (RA) entered Kufa. [13]

Despite this, the Kufans rejected the peace. When they greeted Hasan (RA), they mocked him, saying: “Peace be upon you, O disgracer of the believers!” He replied: “I did not disgrace the believers. I merely disliked shedding their blood for the sake of power.”[14]

Addressing the Poisoning Accusation:

Much propaganda has surrounded the alleged peace terms. Some claim that Hasan (RA) stipulated the Caliphate would return to him after Muawiyah’s (RA) death. However, this narration is *mursal* (disconnected), as it includes ‘Amr ibn Dinar, who never met Hasan (RA). [15] Had such terms existed, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) would surely have invoked them—yet he never did.

Regarding the poisoning, the most reliable evidence is Hasan’s (RA) own statement. According to the principle of legal testimony, the victim’s words are most credible. Ibn Kathir records with an authentic chain that Hasan (RA) said: “I have vomited a piece of my liver due to poisoning. This time it was the harshest poison ever. If the man who poisoned me is the real culprit, then Allah’s punishment is enough. If not, then I do not wish anyone to be killed on my behalf.”[16]

This testimony clears Muawiyah (RA) and dismisses the accusation against Jada bint Ash’ath.

References

[1] Mustadrak Hakim Urdu: Hadith No. 4805, Vol. 4 / Arabic: Vol. 3

[2] al-Fusul al-Muhimmah fi Ma‘rifat al-A’immah, Vol. 2, p. 717

[3] al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, Vol. 6, p. 249; Shamā’il al-Rasūl, p. 582

[4] Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah, Hadith No. 38513, Vol. 21

[5] Tahdhīb al-Kamāl, Vol. 6, p. 244

[6] Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī, Vol. 5, p. 159

[7] Mustadrak Hakim, Hadith No. 4807, Vol. 4 / Vol. 3 in Arabic

[8] Musannaf Abdul Razzaq, Hadith No. 21894, Vol. 9

[9] Mustadrak Hakim, Hadith No. 4808, Vol. 4 / Vol. 3 in Arabic

[10] Kitāb al-Miḥan, p. 141

[11] Majma‘ al-Zawāid, Hadith No. 15006, Vol. 18

[12] Mustadrak Hakim, Hadith No. 4813, Vol. 4 / Vol. 3 in Arabic

[13] Tahdhīb al-Kamāl, Vol. 6, p. 244

[14] Mustadrak Hakim, Hadith No. 4812, Vol. 4 / Vol. 3 in Arabic

[15] Tahdhīb al-Kamāl, Vol. 6, pp. 246–247 [16] al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah Vol. 8, p. 43

Chapter 2

The Succession of Yazid in Light of Historical and Jurisprudential

Introduction:

The succession of Yazid ibn Muawiyah is among the most debated turning points in Islamic history, often viewed solely through the tragic lens of Karbala. However, to truly understand the depth and complexity of this period, one must explore the political, theological, and jurisprudential contexts that preceded it.

This chapter does not begin with Karbala—it begins with the passing of Sayyiduna Hasan (RA), and with Sayyiduna Muawiyah's (RA) deliberation over leadership continuity. It investigates the historical precedent set by the early Caliphs, the scholarly consensus on valid methods of Caliphate appointment, and the structure of political authority during the era of the Companions.

Drawing on classical sources and the works of renowned jurists such as Imam Mawardi, Imam Ash'ari, Imam Ghazali, and others, this chapter presents an evidence-based examination of Yazid's nomination—not as a deviation from tradition, but as a continuation of a method practiced and legitimized by the earliest generations.

The aim is not to defend personalities but to clarify principles—and to distinguish between historically established mechanisms of succession and emotionally driven narratives. By understanding who held the authority to appoint leaders, what the qualifications were, and how allegiance was given in the time of the Salaf, we can better appreciate the rationale behind Sayyiduna Muawiyah's (RA) decision.

This chapter sets the foundation for the events of Karbala by addressing a critical question: Was Yazid's appointment a political innovation, or a legitimate application of established Islamic principles?

Methods of Establishing the Caliphate:

After the martyrdom of Sayyiduna Hasan (RA), Sayyiduna Amir Muawiyah (RA) began consultations regarding appointing Yazid as his successor (Crown Prince).

Before analyzing this, we must consider the circumstances under which the pledges of allegiance (*bay'ah*) took place following the Prophet Muhammad's (PBUH) passing—particularly for Sayyiduna Abu Bakr (RA), Umar (RA), and Uthman (RA). The situation during Yazid's appointment was markedly different.

After the Prophet (PBUH), the most prominent personality was Sayyiduna Abu Bakr (RA), and his Caliphate faced no major dispute. It was established through the allegiance of just three or four companions from the *Ahl al-Hall wa al-'Aqd*—those qualified to elect a Caliph.

Sayyiduna Abu Bakr (RA) later appointed Sayyiduna Umar (RA) as his successor. This was considered *nass*, or explicit designation. (A detailed discussion on the two methods of Caliphate establishment follows).

Scholars of Islamic political jurisprudence have stated that there are only two legitimate methods of appointing a Caliph. Those who formed the foundational consensus on this issue include:

- Imam al-Ash‘ari
- Imam al-Mawardi
- Imam al-Juwayni
- Imam Ibn Hazm
- Imam al-Ghazali
- Imam Kamal ibn Abi Sharif and Kamal ibn al-Hummam
- Imam al-Iji and Sharif al-Jurjani
- Imam al-Baqillani
- Imam Ibn Khaldun
- Hanafi jurists, including Mulla Ali Qari, Imam Abu Hanifa, and Shaykh Jamal al-Din Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Ghaznawi al-Hanafi (May Allah have mercy on them all).

According to these scholars, the two valid methods of Caliphate appointment are:

1. Election by the *Ahl al-Hall wa al-‘Aqd*
2. Nomination by a sitting Caliph during his lifetime

Note: Even a single qualified individual from the Ahl al-Hall wa al-‘Aqd is sufficient to validate a Caliph’s appointment.

Historical Precedents of Succession Historical examples include:

- Sayyiduna Abu Bakr (RA) was appointed through the allegiance of just a few companions; others followed.
- Sayyiduna Umar (RA) was appointed by Abu Bakr (RA) and assumed the Caliphate without dispute.
- Sayyiduna Uthman (RA) was chosen by a council of six members (*Shura*), formed by Umar (RA).
- Sayyiduna Ali (RA) was appointed with the allegiance of just Sayyiduna Ibn Abbas (RA).

These examples demonstrate the validity of both methods. Scholars cited above affirm this consensus.

Importantly, appointing a successor during one’s lifetime was never considered blameworthy. Had it been so, Sayyiduna Abu Bakr (RA) would not have done it. Sayyiduna Umar (RA) selected six individuals from the *Ashara Mubashshara*—the ten promised Paradise—namely: Uthman, Ali, Zubair ibn al-Awwam, Abdur Rahman ibn Awf, Sa‘d ibn Abi Waqqas, and

Talha ibn Ubaydullah (RA). Consensus subsequently formed around Sayyiduna Uthman (RA).

After his martyrdom, Sayyiduna Ali (RA) became Caliph with allegiance from only one companion. However, his Caliphate lacked the unanimous consensus of the Muslim Ummah.

Note: Shah Waliullah Dehlvi wrote in Izalat al-Khafa that it is mutawatir (mass-transmitted) that consensus on Ali's Caliphate was impossible. He also cited an authentic hadith of the Prophet (PBUH) on this matter.

Why was there no consensus? Because Sayyiduna Ali (RA) and the residents of Madinah were accused of complicity—or at least inaction—during the siege and unjust killing of Sayyiduna Uthman (RA) by rebels from Egypt, Kufa, and Iraq. Meanwhile, the governor of Syria, Sayyiduna Muawiyah (RA), led a region determined to seek justice for Uthman (RA). This division led to two battles, marking the beginning of a great *fitnah* (trial).

From this turmoil emerged two factions:

- The rebels and Khawarij
- The proto-Shi'a, who claimed that only the family of Ali (RA) had the right to leadership

These very groups—particularly the Shi'a and Rafidi sects—later became the fiercest critics of Sayyiduna Muawiyah's (RA) appointment of Yazid.

The Geopolitical Divide and the Rationale for Yazid:

The first to advise Yazid's appointment was the noble companion Sayyiduna Mughirah ibn Shu'bah (RA). Upon his suggestion, Sayyiduna Muawiyah (RA) began broader consultations.

Although individuals more virtuous than Yazid existed—including Sayyiduna Husayn ibn Ali, Abdullah ibn Umar, Abdullah ibn Zubair, and Abdur Rahman ibn Abi Bakr (RA)—the appointment raised questions.

To address these, we must first define: Who were the *Ahl al-Hall wa al-'Aqd* during Muawiyah's time? Were they:

- The politically experienced Syrians loyal to Muawiyah and defenders of Uthman (RA)?
- The people of Hijaz or Madinah?
- The Quraysh as a tribe?
- Or the Iraqis?

Syria and Iraq were already at odds. The Syrians blamed Madinans and Iraqis for Uthman's (RA) murder and refused to align with them. The

Iraqis, though outwardly inviting Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), could not be trusted—as previously proven by their betrayal of Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) (as seen in the previous chapter).

Sayyiduna Muawiyah (RA) wished to ensure that leadership remained with Quraysh, particularly the politically astute Banu Umayyah—to maintain stability and counter future *fitnah*. Sayyiduna Ibn Umar (RA) remained distant from politics.[1]

One of the main reasons for appointing Yazid was that the people of Syria were considered the most effective shield against instability—strong, organized, and politically aware. Another factor: Yazid had already observed governance under his father's guidance and thus possessed practical leadership experience.[2] When asked about his leadership vision, Yazid said:

"By Allah! I will deal with them as Sayyiduna Umar (RA) did."[3]

Thus, if a Caliph appoints someone during his lifetime for the benefit and protection of the Ummah, it is not blameworthy—as seen with Abu Bakr (RA), Umar (RA), and Ali (RA) who appointed their successors.[4]

Therefore, no valid objection can be raised against Sayyiduna Muawiyah's decision—especially since the great companion Sayyiduna Abdullah ibn Abbas (RA) himself attested to Yazid's virtues.[5] He and Sayyiduna Ibn Umar (RA) pledged allegiance to Yazid. When the people of Madinah objected, Ibn Umar (RA) strongly rebuked them.[6]

Only Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) abstained—influenced by the Shi'a faction, who persistently invited him through letters to accept their pledge. Despite Sayyiduna Hasan's (RA) advice to avoid these people, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) chose to proceed. Senior companions warned him. What followed is remembered eternally.

Certain historical narratives claim that Sayyiduna Ibn Zubair (RA) had been restrained under Muawiyah (RA), and later regretted his position, allegedly saying:

"I wish Muawiyah were alive—he would have freed me from this misery."[7]

However, the reality is that Sayyiduna Husayn's (RA) intent was reform—particularly of the people of Kufa. This noble mission will be detailed in the upcoming chapters, Insha'Allah.

Having understood the historical and jurisprudential backdrop, we now move forward to the tragic yet momentous event of Karbala—Insha'Allah.

References

[1] Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā, Vol. 4, p. 153

[2] Al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim, p. 222

[3] Al-Aḥād wa al-Mathānī, Hadith 502, Vol. 1, p. 375

[4] Muqaddimah Ibn Khaldun: Vol. 1, p. 265, Sahih al-Bukhari: Hadith 3690, Vol. 5

[5] Al-Ansāb al-Ashrāf, Vol. 5, p. 290

[6] Sahih al-Bukhari, Hadith 7112, Vol. 9

[7] Al-Ansāb al-Ashrāf, Vol. 5, pp. 346–347

Chapter 3

Between Obedience and Opposition: The Moral Dilemma of Husayn

Introduction:

This chapter explores the critical and often misunderstood phase between the reconciliation of Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) with Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA) and the eventual journey of Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) toward Karbala. It examines Sayyiduna Husayn’s (RA) nuanced stance regarding the allegiance to both Mu‘awiyah (RA) and his son Yazid—a position shaped by prophetic foresight, family honor, and deep concern for the unity of the Muslim Ummah.

Through a careful review of historical sources, this chapter dispels the widespread misconception that Husayn (RA) was in direct and persistent opposition to the peace treaty forged by his elder brother. Instead, it highlights his moral restraint, political insight, and commitment to preserving the greater good of the Muslim community—despite immense pressure from factions such as the Kufan Shiites.

From the silent obedience Husayn (RA) maintained during his brother’s lifetime to the complex correspondence that followed Mu‘awiyah’s (RA) death, this chapter reveals how calculated restraint eventually gave way to reluctant confrontation. By tracing these events step by step, the reader will gain a clearer understanding of the ideological and emotional forces that pushed the Ummah ever closer to the fateful plains of Karbala.

The Context of Reconciliation:

Before discussing the departure of Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) towards Karbala, it is necessary to understand his stance regarding allegiance (*bay‘ah*) to Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA) and Amir Yazid.

When Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) reconciled with Sayyiduna Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA), it fulfilled the statement of the Prophet (PBUH), who had foretold: “This son of mine is a leader, and through him, Allah will reconcile two large groups of Muslims.”

However, distorted versions of history present a false narrative, claiming that Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) was not pleased with this reconciliation and the abdication of the Caliphate in favor of Sayyiduna Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA), and that he even strongly opposed Sayyiduna Hasan (RA). In principle, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) should have accepted it—and he did—because the command of the Prophet (PBUH) preceded Sayyiduna Hasan’s (RA) decision. How could it be possible that Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), knowing the Prophet’s (PBUH) prophecy, would reject the reconciliation between Hasan (RA) and Mu‘awiyah (RA)?

While certain historical accounts have painted a negative image of Yazid, they have also fabricated narratives about Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) that are unimaginable for such a noble personality. These biased historians believed that by doing this, they could discredit Yazid. But in the process, they depicted Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) as contradicting the Prophet’s (PBUH) command, which is completely false.

Furthermore, certain unreliable chroniclers fabricated absurdities, such as the claim that Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) once said to Sayyiduna Husayn (RA): “Whenever I make a decision, you oppose me and stand against me. By Allah, I feel like locking you in a house and acting upon my own opinion.” According to this fabrication, upon seeing Sayyiduna Hasan’s (RA) anger, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) remained silent and said, “I will obey you.”[1]

The Kufan Reaction and Husayn's Restraint:

In reality, this reconciliation and abdication were intolerable to the Shiites of Kufa. They openly expressed regret and sorrow over it. Subsequently, the Shiites of Kufa attempted to persuade Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) to withdraw from his decision, but he firmly rejected their request.

They then approached Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) and suggested launching an attack on the army of Sayyiduna Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA), claiming they were prepared for it. However, out of respect for the reconciliation between Hasan (RA) and Mu‘awiyah (RA), and his own agreement to it, Husayn (RA) stopped them, saying: “I have given my allegiance to Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA), and it is impossible for me to rebel.”

Even after this, the Shiites of Kufa continued their efforts to incite Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) against the reconciliation, but once again, they failed.[2] History falsely connected the mourning of the Kufans with Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), whereas the grief was entirely theirs.

Fabricated tales suggest that Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) was displeased with the reconciliation and unwilling to pledge allegiance. But the truth is that Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) could never go against the Prophet’s (PBUH) command, nor did he ever intend to cause division among Muslims. That is why he consistently prevented the Shiites of Kufa from opposing Sayyiduna Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA). He even participated in battles under the leadership of Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA) and Yazid, and accepted honors and gifts from them.

Imam Dhahabi, commenting on one such fabricated claim, writes: “I was informed that Sayyiduna Hasan’s (RA) abdication in favor of Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA) was disliked by his brother Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), whose inclination was towards war. But he restrained himself, suppressed his anger, and obeyed his brother Hasan by pledging allegiance to Sayyiduna Amir Mu‘awiyah.”[3] This is another example of historical distortion misrepresenting Sayyiduna Husayn (RA).

Relocation to Madinah and the Kufan Letters:

Later, both Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) and Husayn (RA) moved from Kufa to Madinah.[4] Despite this, Sayyiduna Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA) continued to care for Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), fulfilling his needs and generously offering him gifts—in amounts unparalleled before or after.[5]

Meanwhile, the Shiites of Kufa remained in contact with Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) through letters after his return to Madinah. Yazid bin Asam narrates that a batch of letters arrived for Sayyiduna Hasan (RA). He called his maid, brought a large vessel, filled it with water, and without opening or reading them, threw all the letters into it. When asked, “O Abu Muhammad! Whose letters are these?” he replied: “They are from the Iraqis—a nation that neither accepts truth nor refrains from

falsehood. I do not fear them for myself, but," (pointing to Husayn) "I fear for him."[6]

Ibn Abd al-Barr writes that when Sayyiduna Hasan (RA) approached death, he advised Sayyiduna Husayn (RA): "O my dear brother! Our father, Sayyiduna Ali (RA)—may Allah have mercy on him—desired the Caliphate after the Prophet (PBUH) passed away. But Allah willed otherwise, and Sayyiduna Abu Bakr (RA) became Caliph. When he passed away, our father again hoped for it, but it went to Umar (RA). Then, Umar entrusted it to a council of six—including our father. We were certain he would get it this time, but it went to Uthman (RA). When Uthman was martyred, the people pledged allegiance to our father. But conflict arose, swords were drawn, and though he tried to stay in power, he did not succeed. I swear by Allah, I think Allah will not combine Khilafah and Nubuwwah in one household again."[7]

This is a critical point that clarifies the entire situation and reflects the profound realism of Sayyiduna Hasan (RA). After Sayyiduna Hasan's (RA) death, the Shiites of Kufa gathered at Sulayman bin Surad's house and sent a condolence letter to Sayyiduna Husayn (RA): "We share in your grief. Your sorrow is our sorrow; your joy is our joy. We await your command."[8] Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) simply replied: "I will inform you of my decision."[9]

The Changing Political Landscape:

Following Sayyiduna Hasan's (RA) death, many expected Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) to naturally become Caliph after Amir Mu'awiyah's (RA) demise. People from Hijaz and the Shiites of Kufa would regularly visit him. No one imagined that anyone other than Husayn (RA) would become Caliph after Mu'awiyah (RA).

However, the Shiites of Kufa didn't only invite Husayn (RA)—they also approached Muhammad bin al-Hanafiyyah (RA), son of Sayyiduna Ali (RA). But he recognized their dangerous motives and refrained from going. He also advised Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) against responding, saying: "These people want to devour us—their only aim is to spill our blood."[10]

At this point, the volume of letters from the Shiites of Kufa increased significantly. When Amir Mu'awiyah (RA) was informed, he said: "Do not meddle with Sayyiduna Husayn, but advise him to fear Allah and safeguard the unity of Muslims."[11]

The constant letters and emotional appeals of the Kufans heavily influenced Sayyiduna Husayn (RA). Amir Mu'awiyah (RA) was fully aware of this and believed that Husayn (RA) would eventually go to Kufa. Thus, he advised Yazid: "Take special care of Husayn ibn Ali (RA), the beloved grandson of the Prophet (PBUH). Treat him kindly and maintain

relations. If anything unforeseen happens, I hope Allah will deal with those who killed his father Ali and humiliated his brother Hasan."[12]

Yazid's Ascension and the Path to Makkah:

After Sayyiduna Amir Mu'awiyah's (RA) death, Yazid ascended the throne. Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) and Sayyiduna Abdullah bin Zubayr (RA) opposed him. However, neither of them explicitly stated a clear reason for refusing allegiance to Yazid, and there is no authentic narration providing a definitive cause for this opposition. This indicates that if no valid reason existed, then such opposition should not have occurred. It is inconceivable that such noble personalities would have taken such a stance without justification—nor would anyone have supported them without reason.

Still, historical accounts portray this opposition as not merely verbal but practical—especially when letters began arriving in larger numbers after Amir Mu'awiyah's (RA) death. When Yazid took power, Walid bin Utbah, the governor of Madinah, summoned Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) and Sayyiduna Abdullah bin Zubayr (RA) to request their allegiance. This move was recommended by Sayyiduna Marwan bin Hakam (RA). But both had already departed for Makkah. Only Muhammad bin al-Hanafiyyah (RA) remained behind.[13]

At a place called Abwā', Sayyiduna Abdullah bin Umar (RA), Sayyiduna Abdullah bin Abbas (RA), and Sayyiduna Abdullah bin Ayyash (RA) met with Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) and Sayyiduna Abdullah bin Zubayr (RA). Ibn Umar (RA) advised them: "Let us return. Follow the path that most people are choosing. Pause for now. If people agree upon Yazid, then do not break the unity of the Ummah. If not, your path will remain open."

But both refused and proceeded to Makkah. Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) stayed at the residence of Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib's family, while Abdullah bin Zubayr (RA) armed himself and sat in the Hijr (near the Ka'bah), encouraging resistance against the Umayyads.[14]

Upon hearing of Sayyiduna Husayn's (RA) arrival in Makkah, the Shiites of Kufa began abandoning allegiance to Yazid and regrouped at Sulayman bin Surad's house. They decided again to send letters to Sayyiduna Husayn (RA). One letter read: "We will no longer offer Friday prayers behind Sayyiduna Nu'mān bin Bashīr (RA)"—a Companion of the Prophet (PBUH) and a close supporter of Yazid.

There were so many letters that they were compiled into 53 register-like volumes, each with signatures from two or three prominent Kufan elders. The core message of these letters was: "The land is fertile, the fruits have ripened, and the time is ripe. Come whenever you wish—an entire armed army is prepared for you."[15]

Now, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) began preparing for his departure to Kufa.

References

[1] Siyar A‘lam al-Nubala, Vol. 3, Pg. 265

[2] Ansab al-Ashraf, Vol. 3, Pg. 148–150

[3] Siyar A‘lam al-Nubala, Vol. 3, Pg. 291

[4] Al-Isabah fi Tamyiz al-Sahabah, Pg. 319

[5] Ansab al-Ashraf, Vol. 3, Pg. 155

[6] Tabarani, Hadith No. 2691, Vol. 3

[7] Al-Isti‘ab, Vol. 1, Pg. 391

[8] Ansab al-Ashraf, Vol. 3, Pg. 151

[9] Ansab al-Ashraf, Vol. 3, Pg. 152

[10] Tahdhib al-Kamal, Vol. 6, Pg. 412–413

[11] Tahdhib al-Kamal, Vol. 6, Pg. 413–414

[12] Tahdhib al-Kamal al-Mizzi, Vol. 6, Pg. 414

[13] Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt, Pg. 233; Ansāb al-Ashrāf, Vol. 5, Pg. 303

[14] Tārīkh al-Umam wa al-Mulūk, Vol. 5, Pg. 343; Tahdhīb al-Kamāl al-Mizzi, Vol. 6, Pg. 415

[15] Tārīkh al-Umam wa al-Mulūk, Vol. 5, Pg. 352–353

Chapter 4

The Call from Kufa — Between Sincere Reform and Historical Distortion

Introduction:

As the political uncertainty following Yazid's accession intensified, a new phase emerged—the flood of letters from Kufa to Sayyiduna Husayn (RA). This chapter explores the motivations behind Husayn’s (RA) eventual decision to depart from Makkah, focusing on the oft-repeated claim that he responded to an invitation of allegiance from the Kufans.

By critically examining historical sources, embellished accounts, and authentic narrations, we distinguish between myth and reality—and uncover Husayn’s (RA) true intent: not rebellion, but reform. Through the role of Muslim ibn Aqil (RA), the shifting loyalty of the Kufans, and the counsel of the Companions, this chapter unveils the complex backdrop to a journey destined for Karbala.

The Embellished Narrative of Muslim ibn Aqil's Mission:

The series of persistent letters from the Shi'ites of Kufa continued, repeatedly urging Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) to come to Kufa without delay. As discussed in the previous chapter, this pressure was mounting. To understand this phase accurately, we must contrast certain historically embellished narratives with the actual words of Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), which expose the baseless claims of rebellion.

Certain accounts allege that Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), in order to assess the situation and verify the truth, sent Muslim ibn Aqil (RA) to Kufa to take allegiance on his behalf and report on the real conditions. Accordingly, Muslim ibn Aqil (RA) set out for Kufa accompanied by Abdur Rahman ibn Abdullah Arhabi, Qays ibn Mus-hir, and 'Amarah ibn 'Ubayd al-Saluli. Upon reaching Madinah, he reportedly added two more leaders to his group.[1] However, this specific story is often recorded in history without a reliable chain of narration.

These same narratives claim that despite having these experienced leaders with him, Muslim ibn Aqil (RA) got lost in the desert, and due to extreme thirst, one of his companions died. Sensing psychological distress and danger, he allegedly wrote to Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) requesting to be recalled. According to this version, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) rejected the request and instructed him to continue toward Kufa.[2]

When Muslim ibn Aqil (RA) eventually reached Kufa, controversial chroniclers like Abu Mikhnaf claim he stayed at the home of Mukhtar al-Thaqafi.[3] Yet, authentic narrations confirm that Muslim ibn Aqil (RA) actually stayed at the house of Hani ibn 'Urwah.[4]

When the Shi'ites of Kufa learned of Muslim ibn Aqil's (RA) arrival, around 30,000 people are said to have pledged allegiance to him.[5] Such a staggering figure prompts historical scrutiny. More peculiarly, it is claimed that this allegiance was done entirely in secret. Claiming that nearly 30,000 people pledged allegiance secretly in a bustling city presents a severe logistical contradiction, exposing the unlikelihood of the tale.

Moreover, this supposed mass allegiance reportedly convinced Muslim ibn Aqil (RA) that the Kufans were sincere. He reportedly wrote to Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) urging him to come to Kufa, claiming that the people were with him.[6] This presents a contradiction in the narrative: earlier, it was claimed that Muslim (RA) wanted to turn back due to danger and Husayn (RA) compelled him to continue; now, the narrative asserts the exact opposite, that the Kufans appeared sincere and Muslim (RA) urged Husayn (RA) forward.

According to this distorted narrative, when Muslim ibn Aqil's (RA) letter reached Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), he supposedly became convinced of their pure intentions, viewed it as a legitimate call, and felt obligated to fulfill his promise, writing back: "As I have read in your letters and heard from your messengers, in shā' Allāh I will come."[7]

Sayyiduna Husayn's (RA) Actual Intent: Reform, Not Rebellion:

To counter these claims, we must look at Sayyiduna Husayn's (RA) actual stated intentions. He declared: "Indeed, I did not set out as a tyrant, nor as a corruptor, nor an oppressor. I have only set out to reform the Ummah of my grandfather (the Prophet ﷺ). I want to enjoin good and forbid evil." He further clarified: "I did not set out seeking power, nor out of arrogance, corruption, or injustice. I only departed to revive the signs of Your religion and establish reform in Your land."

During the caliphate of Mu'awiyah (RA), the people of Kufa persistently wrote to Husayn (RA) inviting him to come, but he consistently refused. Some of them then approached Muhammad bin al-Hanafiyyah (RA) with the same request, and he too declined. When he informed Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) of this, the latter responded with clear foresight: "These people only want to use us for their personal interests and intend to spill blood in our name. They want to kill us."

Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) was extremely concerned. At times, he considered going to put an end to the *fitnah* (discord); at other times, he considered staying away from it.[8] This intention of peace and reform is confirmed by other senior figures. Consider the letter of Sayyiduna Abdullah ibn Abbas (RA) to Yazid: "I hope that Husayn's departure is not for anything that displeases you. I will certainly advise him with all that ensures unity and extinguishes discord."[9]

These narrations clearly show that the stance of Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) was specifically concerning the people of Kufa. His goal was to reform them—not to rise against Yazid. Thus, it is evident that Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) went to Kufa for reform, which is why he initially sent Muslim ibn Aqil (RA) to assess the sincerity of the Kufans' claims. He did not intend to take allegiance, nor did he send Muslim ibn Aqil (RA) for that explicit purpose.

The Final Journey and Continued Warnings:

As Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) began preparing for the journey with his family and close relatives, his brother, Muhammad bin al-Hanafiyyah (RA), advised him passionately: "O my brother, you are the most beloved and honored to me. I sincerely advise you not to proceed. If you do not wish to pledge allegiance to Yazid, then remain quietly where you are. Send your messengers to the people. If they respond, thank Allah. If they turn away, your religion and honor will remain intact. But if you go to

that rebellious city, people will gather around you, disunity will emerge, fighting will break out, and surely, the first strike will be against you. A noble personality like you will be martyred, and your family will be humiliated."

Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) replied: "I am going to Kufa." Muhammad bin al-Hanafiyyah (RA) responded: "Fine. If the situation is peaceful, proceed. If not, retreat to the desert or another place. Assess the people's intentions and act based on knowledge. If a crisis arises, respond with strength and clarity." Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) acknowledged this, saying: "You've certainly given sincere advice. I hope your opinion proves correct."[10]

Other senior Companions continued to warn him of the impending danger:

- **Sayyiduna Abdullah ibn Abbas (RA):**
- He pleaded with Husayn (RA), warning of the Kufans' betrayal. He even advised him to go to Yemen, where the people loved his father. Husayn (RA), however, was resolute.[11]
- **Sayyiduna Abdullah ibn Zubayr (RA):**
- Though himself opposed to Yazid, he asked Husayn (RA): "Are you going to the people who killed your father and poisoned your brother?" Husayn (RA) replied: "It is better for me to be killed elsewhere than for Makkah's sanctity to be violated."[12]
- **Sayyiduna Umar ibn Abdur Rahman (RA):**
- Warned him about the Kufans' love for wealth and their likely betrayal.
- **Sayyiduna Abu Sa'id al-Khudri (RA):**
- Advised him, "Do not rebel against your Imam."[13]
- **Sayyiduna Jabir ibn Abdullah (RA):**
- Warned, "Do not cause division. This action is not praiseworthy."[14]
- **Other Notables:** Figures like Ibn Muti', Yazid ibn al-Asam, and Ahnaf ibn Qays also strongly warned him against the journey.[15]

Despite sincere and repeated advice, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) remained determined. When he called for about twenty people from Banu Abdul Muttalib—men, women, nephews, daughters—Muhammad bin al-Hanafiyyah (RA) again tried to stop him and even prevented his own sons from joining. Husayn (RA) asked: "Are you withholding your sons from helping me where I will be harmed?" He replied: "Why would I endanger both your life and theirs? To us, your life is more valuable."[16]

Conclusion: The Reality of the Journey:

If historically embellished sequences are accepted without scrutiny, history falsely portrays Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) as a political rebel. But the reality is clear: he was warned repeatedly by his closest family and the senior Companions; he was advised not to go because of the known

treachery of the Kufans; and his intention was never to rebel, but to reform a fractured people.

Standing firm against the warnings, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) declared with resolve: “I will go for the purpose of reform.”

References

[1] Al-Mahasin wal-Masawi, al-Bayhaqi, p. 59; Ansab al-Ashraf, vol. 3, p. 159; Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, p. 347

[2] Ansab al-Ashraf, vol. 3, p. 159; Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, p. 347

[3] Tabari, vol. 5, pp. 361–362

[4] Ansab al-Ashraf, vol. 3, p. 224

[5] Al-‘Iqd al-Farid, vol. 5, p. 126

[6] Ansab al-Ashraf, vol. 3, p. 167

[7] Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, p. 353

[8] Al-Bidāyah wan-Nihāyah, vol. 8, p. 161

[9] Tarikh Madinat Dimashq, vol. 14, p. 210; Al-Bidāyah wan-Nihāyah, vol. 8, p. 164; Siyar A‘lam al-Nubalā, vol. 3, p. 304; Bughiyat al-Tālib fī Tārīkh Halab, vol. 6, p. 2611

[10] Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, pp. 341–342

[11] Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, pp. 383–384

[12] Ma‘rifah wal-Tarikh, vol. 2, p. 753

[13] Ansab al-Ashraf, vol. 3, p. 161

[14] Al-Bidāyah wan-Nihāyah, vol. 8, p. 163

[15] Ansab al-Ashraf, vol. 3, p. 163; Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, p. 351

[16] Tahdhib al-Kamal, vol. 6, p. 421

Chapter 5

The Road to Kufa — Warnings Ignored and Fates Foreseen

Introduction:

As the call from Kufa grew louder, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) stood at the crossroads of history, caught between overwhelming counsel to remain and an unshakable resolve to respond. Despite the repeated warnings from senior Companions and family members who foresaw betrayal, Husayn (RA) pressed forward—driven not by rebellion, but by a deep sense of duty to reform a people who had promised allegiance.

This chapter explores the final phase of his journey, the complex web of advice, political restraint, and spiritual conviction that shaped his path toward Kufa—and ultimately, toward Karbala.

The Persistent Counsel of the Companions:

As established in the previous chapter, when Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) resolved to go to Kufa with the intention of reforming its people, several senior Companions (*Sahabah*) and other prominent figures advised him not to proceed. They warned him that the people of Kufa would betray him and have him and his family killed. However, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) remained steadfast in his resolve.

He even respectfully declined the advice of Sayyiduna Abdullah ibn Ja‘far ibn Abi Talib (RA), who, like Sayyiduna Muhammad bin al-Hanafiyyah (RA), had instructed his sons to try to dissuade Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) from undertaking the journey. Assuming Husayn’s (RA) intention stemmed from fear of the governor of Makkah, ‘Amr ibn Sa‘id ibn al-‘As, Abdullah ibn Ja‘far (RA) requested a letter of safety for him. ‘Amr ibn

Sa‘id responded, “You may write whatever you wish, and I will sign and seal it.”[1]

It is important to note a significant historical discrepancy: while later narratives have overwhelmingly portrayed Sayyiduna Husayn’s (RA) departure as a rebellion, early actions and testimonies suggest otherwise.

For instance, when the senior Companion Sayyiduna Ibn ‘Umar (RA) learned of this journey, he met with Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) and asked, “Where are you going?” Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) replied, “I intend to go to Iraq,” and then showed him the letters sent by the Shiites of Kufa containing pledges of allegiance. Sayyiduna Ibn ‘Umar (RA) implored him by Allah to return, but Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) declined.

Ibn ‘Umar (RA) then said, “Let me narrate a hadith to you that I have not told anyone before: Gabriel (AS) came to the Prophet (PBUH) and gave him the choice between this world and the Hereafter. The Prophet (PBUH) chose the Hereafter. You are from the family of this Prophet. By Allah, whenever a member of the Prophet’s family is burdened with the affairs of this world, Allah diverts him from it—and in that is goodness. So return!”

He reminded him of the betrayals and pain his father, Sayyiduna ‘Ali (RA), had experienced at the hands of the Kufans. Despite this, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) refused to turn back. At that, Ibn ‘Umar (RA) embraced him and wept, saying, “May Allah protect you from being killed.”[2] Afterwards, Ibn ‘Umar (RA) would often remark: “In going to Kufa, Husayn overcame us. I swear, what happened to his father and brother should have served as a lesson. The *fitnah* and disrespect from the Kufans toward them should have remained vivid in his mind. It would have been better for him to avoid any such movement during his lifetime, for remaining with the united group (*jama‘ah*) is better.”[3]

Crucially, every single individual who tried to stop Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) from going to Kufa warned him specifically of the Kufans’ treachery and disloyalty. None of these senior figures reminded him of any wrongdoing by Yazid, nor did anyone claim that Yazid would oppress or kill him. Even those who hinted at his potential martyrdom attributed it strictly to the betrayal of Kufa. Still, Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) remained firm in his belief that the Kufans would honor their promises, viewing the situation as an urgent opportunity to bring about reform. Interestingly, even the letters sent by the Kufans contained no direct criticism of Yazid or claims of his oppression. Meanwhile, Muslim ibn ‘Aqil (RA)—who had been sent ahead—took the sheer volume of the letters at face value.

The Position of Yazid and the Umayyad Leadership:

Yazid was being regularly updated on these developments. However, he made no immediate move—perhaps intending to deal with Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) with leniency, considering the instigation of the Kufans. But once it became clear that Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) would indeed proceed to Kufa, Yazid wrote a letter to Sayyiduna ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abbas (RA), stating:

“We believe that some people from the East have approached Husayn and enticed him with hopes of leadership. You are well-experienced in such matters. If he is acting upon their deception, he will have broken ties and brought dishonor to his lineage. You are a respected elder of the family and someone we trust. Prevent him from creating division and discord.”[4]

Yazid also sent poetic verses directed to Sayyiduna Husayn (RA) and the Quraysh residing in Makkah and Madinah, warning them of the deception of war:

“Those who set out early in the morning for futile causes, riding strong camels that struggle under the burden... Though far from the Kaaba, inform the Quraysh that between me and Husayn, only Allah and kinship remain. By the sacredness of the Kaaba courtyard! I beseech Husayn through the covenant of Allah and the bonds by which covenants are fulfilled. You are honored due to your mother, Fatimah (RA). By my life! She was chaste, noble, and the epitome of generosity. No one can match her excellence; she is the daughter of the best among the people — the Prophet (PBUH). Her excellence is your excellence, and others from your tribe also share in it. Indeed, I know Husayn as one who is either certainly known or well-assumed, and at times assumptions are in harmony with certainty. Soon, those whom you call your supporters will abandon your corpse, leaving you for vultures and carrion birds to devour. O my people! Do not ignite the fire of war once it has been extinguished; grasp firmly the rope of peace. Do not become rebellious, for rebellion leads only to ruin. Whoever drinks from the cup of rebellion dies of indigestion. Verily, it was war that deceived those who came before you and led to their destruction. Be just with your people and do not plunge them into destruction through arrogance. Indeed, the steps of the arrogant often slip due to their pride.”[5]

Sayyiduna Ibn ‘Abbas (RA) replied to Yazid, stating: “I hope Husayn will not act in a way displeasing to you. I will try my utmost—with affection and kindness—to calm his enthusiasm and dissuade him.”[6]

These exchanges make it evident that Yazid feared a potential confrontation and its consequences. They also reveal his acknowledgment of Sayyiduna Husayn’s (RA) noble status, serving as a preemptive disclaimer that if any tragedy were to occur, it would be the tragic result of Kufan deception rather than Umayyad intent.

The Appointment of Ubaydullah ibn Ziyad and the Shift in Kufa:

Once Muslim ibn ‘Aqil (RA) received the pledges of allegiance, the then-governor of Kufa, Sayyiduna Nu‘man ibn Bashir al-Ansari (RA), realized the gravity of the situation and addressed the people:

“O servants of Allah! Fear Allah and stay away from fitnah and discord—they bring destruction and death. Whoever does not fight me, I will not fight him. Whoever does not attack me, I will not attack him. I do not wish to argue, nor do I wish to kindle the fire of conflict or accuse anyone. But you have disowned me, broken your allegiance, and violated your commitment to your Imam. By Allah, I will strike with my sword as long as its handle remains in my hand—even if no one among you stands with me. I trust that those who stand for truth will be more numerous than those who follow falsehood.”[7]

When this sermon had no effect on the Shi‘ah of Kufa, firm administrative action became necessary. Yazid appointed the experienced and politically astute ‘Ubaydullah ibn Ziyad—then governor of Basra—as the new governor of Kufa. While some later critics argue that by appointing Ibn Ziyad, Yazid became responsible for the events that followed, this perspective often overlooks the escalating unrest in Kufa. In fact, Amir Mu‘awiyah (RA) had foreseen such developments before his death, leaving a document recommending that ‘Ubaydullah ibn Ziyad be made governor of Kufa in anticipation of future challenges.[8]

Subsequently, Yazid sent a letter to Ibn Ziyad stating: “The well-wishers of Kufa have informed me that Muslim ibn ‘Aqil is gathering a faction to divide the Muslims. Upon reading this letter, proceed to Kufa immediately. If you find the situation manageable, arrest Muslim. If not, exile him. If things worsen and no other solution is viable, then fight him—but only as a last resort.”[9]

Upon receiving this letter, Ibn Ziyad departed for Kufa, warning the people of Basra that any chaos originating from them would be met with dire consequences. Accompanied by prominent figures including Muslim ibn ‘Amr al-Bahili and Sharik ibn al-A‘war al-Harithi, Ibn Ziyad entered Kufa with his face concealed. The Kufans, expecting Sayyiduna Husayn (RA), mistakenly believed he was the Prophet's grandson. They greeted him joyously: “Peace be upon you, O son of the Messenger of Allah! Welcome, your arrival is blessed!”

As the crowd swelled, Muslim ibn ‘Amr finally exclaimed: “This is the governor, ‘Ubaydullah ibn Ziyad!”

Upon reaching the palace, Ibn Ziyad summoned the people and addressed them: “Whoever obeys us will be treated with kindness. But whoever opposes us and stirs fitnah—their outcome will be evil.”[10] The

immediate challenge for the new governor would now be locating Muslim ibn ‘Aqil (RA) to quell the rising unrest within the city.

References

[1] Kitab al-Mihan, p.130; Al-Bidayah wan-Nihayah, vol. 8, p.167

[2] Tarikh Madinah Dimashq, vol. 14, pp. 201–202, 208

[3] Tarikh Madinah Dimashq, vol. 14, p. 208

[4] Tarikh Madinah Dimashq, vol. 14, p. 210

[5] Tarikh Madinah Dimashq, vol. 14, p. 210

[6] Tarikh Madinah Dimashq, vol. 14, p. 210

[7] Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, pp. 355–356

[8] Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, p. 356

[9] Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, p. 357

[10] Tarikh al-Umam wal-Muluk, vol. 5, p. 358